

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments have been made to clarify aspects in the claims. The amendments are consistent with the disclosure originally filed. The amendments have also been particularly presented to avoid, where applicable, any admission or estoppel, generally, negatively effecting the scope of protection provided by the disclosure and claims of the present application, and particularly to avoid prosecution history estoppel, limitation of the scope of equivalences, or the like. Claims 1, 29 are pending in this application and claims 1, 2, 8, 19, and 23-27 are amended.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 concerns

The examiner has expressed concerns to the claims under §102 (b) and cites Japanese Patent No. 3-188887 (the "Japan reference"). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicant makes clarifying amendments to the claims to include the following: "a blade element directly connected to said blade body member" and "wherein said blade element is entirely user removable and replaceable from said blade body member" in claim 1, and "a blade element entirely user removably and replaceably inserted into a blade body member wherein said blade element is directly connected to said blade body member" in claim 19.

The Japan reference does not disclose a removable and replaceable blade element directly connected to a blade body member. The Office states in its Examiner's Answer that the Japan reference discloses that a blade element (at 7) is entirely removable from a blade body member (at 1-3) where the blade (at 7) is pivotable with respect to the blade body member (at 1-3) and is pivotably moved upward as seen in the dotted lines in figure 1 *where it is entirely removed from the blade body member.* (emphasis added) As such, the Japan reference is differentiated from independent claims 1 and 19 in that the blade element (7) is not *directly connected* to the blade body member (1-3). The present

application may include a blade element (3) which is directly connected to a blade body member (10) such as shown in Figure 1. Further, the Japan reference does not teach nor show that a blade element can be user removable and replaceable from a blade body member of which a blade element is directly connected. While the Japan reference discusses *removal of contaminants* adhered to a blade, it does not discuss a user removable and replaceable blade.

In addition, Applicant asserts that the Japan reference does not teach or suggest an acute angle end point presented at an end of a blade element. The Office states in its Examiner's Answer that the Japan reference discloses two end points at the uppermost and lowermost portion of a blade edge (at 8) and if one of these points is obtuse the other must be acute. Applicant fails to see two end points on the blade in the Japan reference. The neck region (5) and the frame (4) covers up the shape of the blade and only exposes one end point – and obtuse angle end point. The Office makes an assumption that the blade at the hidden uppermost portion is an acute angle, however it could be a right angle, another obtuse angle or the like. Further, the Japan reference neither shows nor discusses the actual shape of the blade. Accordingly, claims 1 and 19 are differentiated from the Japan reference in this respect as well.

Because the Japan reference does not teach all the elements or steps of the invention as claimed, independent claims 1 and 19, as well as all of the dependent claims thereof, are not anticipated by the Japan reference. Since claims 1 and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 2-18 and 20-29 are also believed to be in condition for allowance in that they each incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claims to which they are dependent. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). Should the office require further explanation, the Applicant stands ready to supplement the above remarks should it be necessary.

Further, concerns under § 103 were raised with respect to only dependent claims. Claims 2-18 and claims 20-29 are ultimately dependent on independent claim 1 or claim 19. Since claims 1 and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 2-18 and

20-29 are also believed to be in condition for allowance in that they each incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claims to which they are dependent. *See* 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). Should the office require further explanation, the Applicant stands ready to supplement the above remarks should it be necessary.

In addition, other clarifying amendments are made to the claims to correct typographical errors and antecedent basis and clarify the claim language.

Importantly, it should be understood that the amendments submitted herein are made as a matter of practicality only, and should not to be construed as creating any situation of file wrapper estoppel or the like as all rights are expressly reserved and may be pursued in this or other applications, such as divisionals, continuations, or continuations-in-part if desired. Amendments are made for tangential issues of clarity and as a matter of the Office's convenience or expedience only. The amendments should not be interpreted as an action that in any way surrenders a particular equivalency, surrenders any right to patent coverage, or otherwise limits any rights that the Applicant may now or hereafter assert. It should be understood that, unless and to the extent deemed broadened by this amendment, and even as amended, the Applicant expressly reserves all rights, including but not limited to: all rights to maintain the scope of literal coverage with respect to any element as may have existed under the language previously presented, all rights to maintain the scope of equivalency coverage as may have existed under the language previously presented, and all rights to re-present the prior language at any time in this or any subsequent application. To the extent currently foreseeable, no change or reduction in *direct or* equivalency coverage is believed to exist, and no change or reduction in *direct or* equivalency coverage is intended through the presentation of this amendment.

The Applicant having addressed each of the action's concerns, respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections to the application. Allowance of claims 1-29 is requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

Dated this 14 day of April, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
SANTANGELO LAW OFFICES, P.C.
By Nicole A. Ressue

Nicole A. Ressue
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,665
125 South Howes, Third Floor
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
(970) 224-3100

BEST AVAILABLE COPY